

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Claims 38-62 are pending, of which claims 38 and 51 have been amended.

5

35 U.S.C. §102 Claim Rejections

Claims 38-39, 42-43, 45, 51-53, and 55-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,812,156 to Bullock et al. (hereinafter, "Bullock") (*Office Action* p.2). Applicant respectfully traverses
10 the rejection.

Claim 38 recites a method comprising "receiving a component of a printing device that has been utilized within the printing device and subsequently removed from the printing device, the component including a
15 memory component that maintains printing-related data", "retrieving the printing-related data from the memory component after the memory component has been removed from the printing device", and "utilizing the printing-related data for printing analysis."

Bullock does not show or disclose receiving a component of a printing
20 device that has been removed from the printing device and retrieving printing-related data from a memory component that is utilized for printing analysis, as recited in claim 38. Bullock only describes that a cartridge memory or a printhead memory stores data that is used by a control procedure to calculate control values, adjust printer control parameters, and to control the operation
25 and print quality of media output from a printer while the cartridge and/or printhead is installed for operation within the printer (Bullock col.3, lines39-44; col.4, lines 15-17; col.5, lines 6-9).

Accordingly, claim 38 is allowable over Bullock and Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 39, 42-43, and 45 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 38. Additionally, some or all of claims 39, 42-43, and 45 are allowable over Bullock for independent reasons. For example:

Claim 43 recites "utilizing the printing-related data for marketing analysis." Bullock does not show or disclose utilizing printing-related data for marketing analysis, as recited in claim 43. The Office cites Bullock for a list of cartridge memory data and a list of printhead memory data (*Office Action* p.3; col.4, line 14 to col.5, line 5). However, there is no indication in the cited sections of Bullock that the memory data is utilized for marketing analysis or that the memory data would even be applicable for marketing analysis. As described above in the response to the rejection of claim 38, Bullock only describes that the memory data is utilized for operational aspects of the printer. Accordingly, claim 43 is allowable over Bullock and the §102 rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 51 recites a method comprising "receiving a replaceable printing component that has been utilized within a printing device and subsequently removed from the printing device, the replaceable printing component having print media usage data maintained therewith, the print media usage data being collected during one or more printing operations", "retrieving the print media usage data from the replaceable printing component after the replaceable printing component has been removed from the printing device", and "utilizing the print media usage data for printing analysis."

As described above in the response to the rejection of claim 38, Bullock does not show or disclose receiving a replaceable printing component that has been removed from a printing device and retrieving print media usage data from the replaceable printing component that is utilized for printing analysis, as recited in claim 51. Bullock only describes that a cartridge memory or a printhead memory stores data that is used by a control procedure to calculate control values, adjust printer control parameters, and to control the operation and print quality of media output from a printer while the cartridge and/or printhead is installed for operation within the printer (Bullock col.3, lines39-44; col.4, lines 15-17; col.5, lines 6-9).

Accordingly, claim 51 is allowable over Bullock and Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 52-53 and 55-56 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 51. Additionally, some or all of claims 52-53 and 55-56 are allowable over Bullock for independent reasons. For example:

Claim 56 recites “utilizing the print media usage data for marketing analysis.” As described above in the response to the rejection of claim 43, Bullock does not show or disclose utilizing print media usage data for marketing analysis, as recited in claim 56. There is no indication in the cited sections of Bullock that the memory data is utilized for marketing analysis or that the memory data would even be applicable for marketing analysis. Accordingly, claim 56 is allowable over Bullock and the §102 rejection should be withdrawn.

25

35 U.S.C. §103 Claim Rejections

Claims 40-41, 44, 54, 57, and 61-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over Bullock in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,658,219 to Ito et al. (hereinafter "Ito") (*Office Action* p.5). Applicant respectfully
 5 traverses the rejection.

Claims 46-50 and 58-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over Bullock in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,097,497 to McGraw (hereinafter, "McGraw") (*Office Action* p.7). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

10

Claims 40-41 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 38 which is allowable over Bullock for at least the reasons described above in response to the §102 rejection of claim 38. Claims 40-41 are also allowable over the Bullock-Ito combination because Ito does not address the
 15 deficiencies of Bullock as described above in the response to the rejection of claim 38.

Claims 54 and 61-62 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 51 which is allowable over Bullock for at least the reasons described above in response to the §102 rejection of claim 51. Claims 54 and 61-62 are
 20 also allowable over the Bullock-Ito combination because Ito does not address the deficiencies of Bullock as described above in the response to the rejection of claim 51.

Claims 44 and 57 recite "developing a product distribution scheme
 25 based on the printing-related data" (claim 44), and developing a product distribution scheme based on the print media usage data" (claim 57). The Office recognizes that Bullock does not teach these features (*Office Action* p.6).

The Office cites Ito for teaching a product distribution scheme based on printing-related data and contends that it would have been obvious to modify Bullock with the teaching of Ito to ensure that an operational cartridge is being sent out for use (*Ito* col.15, lines 10-35).

5 However, Ito simply describes that a reusable toner cartridge can be recycled and loaded with toner, and that the amount of toner can be written to a cartridge memory (*Ito* col.15, lines 10-35). Ito does not describe any such product distribution scheme based on the printing-related data or print media usage data, as recited in respective claims 44 and 57. Accordingly, claims 44
10 and 57 are allowable over the Bullock-Ito combination and the §103 rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 46 recites that “the printing-related data includes a total number of print media routed in the printing device and a total number of a particular
15 type of print media having a determinable media identifier routed in the printing device.” Claims 47-50 and 58-60 recite similar features, such as the “printing-related data includes a percentage of a total number of a particular type of print media to a total number of print media routed in the printing device” (claim 47). Bullock and/or McGraw do not teach or suggest data that
20 includes a total number of print media routed in a printing device and a total number of a particular type of print media having a determinable media identifier routed in the printing device, as recited in claim 46.

The Office cites Bullock for teaching a total number of print media and that “other printing-related data may be stored as well” (*Office Action* p.7;
25 *Bullock* col.4, line 14 to col.5, line 16). Bullock only indicates that a printhead memory stores a number of pages printed (*Bullock* col.5, line 5). There is no

indication in Bullock that the "other printing-related data" is a determinable type of print media, as recited in claim 46.

The Office only cites McGraw for teaching that a particular type of print media having a determinable media identifier can be determined (*Office Action* p.7; *McGraw* col.2, lines 13-24). However, similar to Bullock, there is no indication in McGraw that stored printing-related data includes a total number of a particular type of print media having a determinable media identifier routed in the printing device, as recited in claim 46. Neither Bullock nor McGraw teach or suggest printing-related data that includes determinable types of print media.

Accordingly, claim 46, as well as claims 47-50 and 58-60, are allowable over the Bullock-McGraw combination and the §103 rejection should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Pending claims 38-62 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the subject application. If any issues remain that preclude issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: Oct. 19, 2004

By:



David A. Morasch
Reg. No. 42,905
(509) 324-9256 x 210